DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-21 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 19-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims. It is noted in the attached interview

summary that the Applicant was contacted regarding this allowable subject matter and

asked that the office being mailed to examine the issue further.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Bird et al.</u> ('Bird' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,321,235) and further

in view of <u>Turner et al.</u> ('Turner' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0060913).

As per claim 1, <u>Bird</u> teaches

A method for providing package resolution in a database system, the method

comprising: (see abstract and background)

providing a SET CURRENT PACKAGE PATH statement within a server of the

database system, wherein the SET CURRENT PACKAGE PATH statement identifies a

selected list of a plurality of qualified package collections during runtime (packages with

fully qualified names is inserted into list of packages, column 5, lines 47-55), wherein

each identified package collection includes a plurality of packages and each package is

usable during execution of one or more other database statements issued by the

application, the list of qualified package collections of the selected package collections

in which to search; (application VIOLA has two packages it uses, column 4, lines 20-30;

figure 3)

responsive to issuance of a database statement by the application, executing the

database statement to search the qualified package collections and locate at least one

of the plurality of packages included in at least one of the identified package collections,

the located at least one package for use with the database statement; (global cache

where one entry for SQL statement, column 4, lines 35-40; figure 3)

and caching the at least one package in a storage of the server, the at least one

package being used during execution of the one or more other database statements

issued by the application. (global cache, column 4, lines 45-48)

Bird does not explicitly indicate " specifying a desired search precedence order",

"in the search precedence order".

However, Turner discloses "specifying a desired search precedence order", "in

the search precedence order" (search order preferences of search paths, paragraph

[0051], lines 18-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bird and Turner because using the steps of "specifying a desired search precedence order", "in the search precedence order" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by providing options that allow prioritization of search locations to provide quicker resolutions. This gives the user the advantage of more efficient search strategies.

As per claim 3,

the list of package collections include a combination of literals, host variables, keywords, and null string. (column 5, lines 25-30)

As per claim 4,

each package includes a collection ID and a package ID. (column 5, lines 35-40; figure 4)

As per claim 5,

the database system is a distributed database system. (column 3, lines 25-30)

As per claims 6 and 8-10,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 3-5, respectively, and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 11 and 13-15,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given

above for rejected claims 1 and 3-5, respectively, and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 16,

the database statement is a structured query language (SQL) statement. (column

3, lines 57-60)

As per claim 17,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above

for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 18,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above

for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/1/2010 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

6.   Applicant argues that <u>Bird</u> does not disclose "providing any statement that identifies or provides a selected list of particular package collections to search during runtime as recited in claim 1", although the Applicant does not explain how the claimed invention is different than the cited reference. It is noted that the Applicant must discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them. However, as previous submitted <u>Bird</u> discloses a fully qualified name of a package is inserted into a list of packages in the static SQL cache of the global cache (column 5, lines 47-55), and these fully qualified names could be considered full paths. This list reads on the setting of a package path value associated with a list of package collections that is a list of qualified package collections during runtime since <u>Bird's</u> package is inserted into a list of packages and this list is available at runtime via the global cache to process static queries (column 5, lines 12-20). Therefore <u>Bird</u> discloses the limitations.

7.   Applicant also argues that <u>Bird</u> does not teach "providing a statement that specifies a particular search precedence order for package collections and searching in package collection in that specified order". It is respectfully submitted that Bird teaches package collections as shown in the previous answer to argument, but the remaining limitations regarding a preference order for searching are taught by the newly added <u>Turner</u> reference as shown in the above 35 USC 103 claim rejections. Therefore, with respect to Applicant's remaining arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jay A Morrison/
Examiner, Art Unit 2168

Jay Morrison
TC2100